

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/556,934	YAMASHITA ET AL.	
	Examiner COLIN W. SLIFKA	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) COLIN W. SLIFKA. (3) George A. Loud.

(2) Curtis Mayes. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2010.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant
2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes
If Yes, brief description: _____ e) No.

Claim(s) discussed: 1+2

Identification of prior art discussed: References of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the proposed amendment regarding "aggregate." Examiner expressed that such an amendment is ~~not~~ necessary & may even be redundant and/or lead to indefiniteness issues.

Discussed the primary + secondary references of record.

Examiner will review the machine translation of Kurata with a translator to determine the correct meaning.

/COLIN W SLIFKA/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793